

All remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper are to be directed (post paid) to the General Agent.
TERMS.—\$2 00 per annum, payable in advance; or \$2 50 at the expiration of six months.
Six copies will be sent to one address for ten dollars, if payment be forwarded in advance.
ADVERTISEMENTS making less than one square, inserted three times for 75 cents, one square for \$1 00.
Financial Committee.—FRANCIS JACKSON, ELIAS GRAS LORING, EDWARD QUINCY, SAMUEL PHILBRICK, WENDELL PHILLIPS. [This committee is responsible only for the financial economy of the paper.]

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

VOL. XVII.—NO. 36.

REFUGE OF OPPRESSION

ABOLITIONISM.

Dr. Dewey's letter to the Editors of the New-York Christian Inquirer.

In a late singular discussion in London, before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and a subsequent letter from the Rev. Dr. Hutton to the Rev. Dr. Parkman and others, I observe certain allusions which seem to call upon me particularly for some notice. Dr. Hutton speaks of the apathy on the subject of slavery¹ of the President of the American Unitarian Association.² And in the discussion just referred to it is asserted that the Unitarian pulpits in America have been disgraced and polluted by the presence in them of the defenders of slavery.³ With regard to Dr. Hutton's allusion to the President of the American Unitarian Association, I suppose it must have been intended for me, because I think he could not have known at the time of his writing, (June 16th, I believe,) that I had resigned that office. And on this point, begging leave to refer Dr. Hutton to my sermon against 'The Annexation of Texas,' or to a discourse on 'The Slavery Question,' in a volume of mine just published, I respectfully ask him what ground he has for charging me with apathy on this subject. Those discourses may have little enough of any other merit, but they must have the merit of earnestness, and they did me great injustice. With reference to what is said of the Unitarian pulpits, I am glad to suppose that a full share of it is intended for me, from the circumstance that the Abolition press has always made me the subject of unfriendly comment, and particularly so of late, in sundry articles on my preaching last winter in Boston.

On this subject I wish to say a few words to my brethren in England and in this country, and I take the present method of doing so; for I have no time to write private letters to them on a subject of so little importance. Still reputation has given me, and if any one is surprised that I could let the articles of last winter pass without notice, I cannot help those who prefer to doubt it. I do not write this letter to enlighten them upon my views of the subject.

Indeed the question of human slavery in this country, is one of such solemn interest, of such awful and overshadowing importance, that all personal interests in connection with it sink to comparative indifference. It would be a small matter that I and others are misrepresented and wronged; it would be a slight evil, and worthy of little notice, that those who place themselves in the front rank in this great debate, are committing the ordinary mistakes of reformers, if those misakes and misrepresentations did not injure to the sacred cause which so many have at heart. But what is the position which Abolitionist occupies in this country—not only at the South, but at the North, which has emancipated its own slaves long ago, and which is and ever has been, in favor of the abolition of slavery? Abolitionism might have been expected, *a priori*, to have found none but friends here. And yet what is this fact? Why, Abolitionists have brought themselves into the condition of martyrs, and they are not far from right. Almost every respectable and influential man comes before the public, whether in speech or print, to declare his protest against slavery, or to reason against the system, takes special pains to say that he is not an abolitionist. Men avoid the name as they would a pestilence. Abolitionism does not hold the leadership in this great question; its newspapers are scarcely read but by those of its own party. The anti-slavery strength of the North lies in the heart of the whole people, and not in that party. David, the man of war, must not build the temple, but some more wise and peaceful successor.

I should be sorry for this heavy opprobrium that has fallen upon the Abolition party, if it were not just. But could it be otherwise? Can the cause of humanity be promoted by inhumanity—such as this party has shown to all who differ from it; and most to those who differ least? Can a work be wrought out by wrath, or of mercy by violence, or of justice by injustice? I have no doubt that many of the Abolitionists are conscientious men; I have no disposition to deny that they are such. I ask, then, the editors and readers of all newspapers, solemnly to ponder one text in the New Testament. It is in Matthew, chap. vii: 1st and 2d verses: 'Judge not, lest ye be judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.' These are awful words. They have a meaning that demands to be deeply considered. I know of no precept in the New Testament that is often violated than this; and in this temerity the Abolition press seems to me to exceed even that of the political press of the country.

It is a strange thing. Is it so very agreeable to impute bad motives to men, even if they were law? It is one of the significant and admirable observations of our poet-essayist, Waldo Emerson, that the critic criticizes himself.

I know what will be said in reply: for I have endeavored to place myself in the position of the Abolitionists; and to exercise towards them a censure which they seldom show to others. They will say: 'We are engaged in a great cause; the cause of human rights. You do not come up to the help of this cause as you ought. You oppose slavery, but do not oppose it in the right way. We must be allowed to express our indignation; and in the heat of this great controversy, we cannot, very carefully, choose and pick our words.'

Now for my preaching in Washington. I was delivering a series of discourses there last winter, on the great moral traits of Christianity. Among the multitudinous topics treated of, on Christianity, I spoke mainly of its moderation; and enumerating several outrages of the day, I said that they were not to be found in the New Testament. But they will give the entire passage.

'No extravagant propositions, no wild projects, no proposals of violent changes, disfigure the pages of the New Testament. The great Reformer does not raise the old foundations to build new. He receives what is good in the Old Law, and improves it—takes the highest idea from the past, and carries it higher. The earliest Christian worship is modelled after that of the synagogue; and baptism follows without any positive ordinance, into the place of circumcision. All is gentle and gradual, and all moral changes ever must be.'

Whatever we may think of its course, the new religion certainly was opposed to all extravagance, all ultraism, yet unavoidably left some room for the Abolition press—found terms applied to him, for the first time in his life, such as being only to the uttermost dishonest and infamy;—and any man is naturally shocked at such treatment;—he said 'I felt very bad at first; but he found after a day or two, that nobody knew it—at least, nobody that he knew.' Such was my own experience, I was shocked at first. I had walked through life with a robe unstained till these men threw it upon me. I was naturally shocked to find terms applied to me such as being only to the most unprincipled villains. But I soon found that nobody knew it, and I thought I would not spread this Abolition abuse beyond the bounds in which it was made to flow.

Now for my preaching in Washington. I was



1st All men are born free and equal—with certain natural, essential and unalienable rights—among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

2nd Three millions of the American people are in chains and slavery—held as chattels personal, and bought and sold as marketable commodities.

3rd Seventy thousand infants, the offspring of slave parents, kidnapped as soon as born, and permanently added to the slave population of Christian, (3rd) Republic, (1st) America every year.

4th Immediate, Unconditional Emancipation.

5th Slaveholders, Slave-traders and Slave-drivers are to be placed on the same level of infamy, and in the same abominable category, as kidnappers and men-stealers—a race of monsters unparalleled in their assumption of power, and their despotic cruelty.

6th The existing Constitution of the United States is a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell. NO UNION WITH SLAVEMOLDERS!

J. BROWN YERRINGTON, PRINTER.

WHOLE NO. 869.

SELECTIONS.

From the London Inquirer.

AMERICAN CORRESPONDENCE.

The most oppressed, the most unresisting, and the most pitiable race, which the world has ever known.—Quoted in Leading Article of *Israels*, July 3, 1847.

In the interests of that race, Sir, and in the confiding hope that the Unitarians of England will not be found among the most backward sections of her people in confirming the fact declared at the conclusion of a late memorable article—never to be forgotten, to the honor of the *Inquirer*—(I refer to the number of May 8, 1847)—that the great body of the people of England had everywhere received the great American Abolitionists with enthusiasm, and had resolved to omit no means of making their feelings respecting THE CRIME AND CURSE OF SLAVERY, fully known to all the parties concerned;—I respectfully submit to your readers the following important letter, received by the last packet from America, and addressed to me by the Rev. Samuel May, Jr., of the city of Boston.

Accompanying this letter was one from the Rev. Dr. Parkman, of the same place, remonstrating on the character ascribed to him of being 'one of the most pro-slavery men in all the North, and holding Abolitionism in scorn' and 'despising' on what authority he had allowed myself to repeat so erroneous and injurious an accusation.'

I have taken other opportunities of explaining how it was, that, in the course of the discussion at Hackney, I was led to make use of the information I had only then just seen, in a communication from America, respecting the character of that gentleman in relation to this subject. Most certainly the question was not of my raising. The high anti-slavery character of the gentleman who signed the invitation to the Unionists of Great Britain, being assumed by other parties, it became necessary to declare not only such facts as I had observed myself, but such as had also been stated on authority which I could not disbelieve. The name of that authority was called for. But even had the letter quoted been to myself—which it was not—I could hardly feel justified at the moment in betraying the confidence of a private correspondence. I am now, however, enabled to say, that, by the spontaneous desire of the writer, the seal has been removed from that correspondence, and by consequence, the responsibility of ascribing to Dr. Parkman the sentiments complained of in relation to the distasteful institution of which he is a professed 'abhorner,' no longer remains with your very faithful servant,

GEORGE ARMSTRONG.

BOSTON, June 30, 1847.
MY DEAR SIR.—The last steamship brought us the *Inquirer*, containing a report of proceedings at the Annual Meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, which I read with much attention. I was very glad to see that Mr. Estlin brought before the meeting the subject of the Boston invitation to the English Unitarians. Had the Association been willing to leave to private and unofficial response what had originated in a wholly private and unofficial way, the whole trouble, it seems to me, would have been avoided. I was also glad to see that you, Sir, pursued the subject; if it had had no other effect, it certainly has had this, of developing the feelings of several prominent English Unitarians towards those in this country who, in the face of every opposition, are laboring and have with some success labored to remove the sin and curse of slavery from the land; and it has shown, too, some misconceptions of the aims and position of the American Abolitionists which we are bound to set right.

But let me recur, for a moment, to the Boston invitation, just to ask, why it was originated and sent, at once in so formal and so imprescriptible a manner? Why was it not sent by the American Unitarian Association, as it easily might, and certainly would, have been? The American Unitarian Association is the only body known to British Unitarians, as officially and authoritatively (if I may so speak) representing American Unitarians. And had the invitation been accepted, and delegates sent to our annual meetings from Great Britain and Ireland, they would have found no other meetings to attend, distinctively Unitarian, save those of the American Unitarian Association.

I dare say, my dear Sir, that you have had other letters, from American sources, giving you information of the position and progress of things here touching the slavery question. But I presume it was to recent letters of my own that you referred, in some remarks which you made at the meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. If so, I wish you had expressly so declared, when your authority for certain statements was called for. I never have written, please God I never will write, one word on this subject of slavery which I do not believe to be the honest truth, nor one which I will shrink from defending anywhere. The charge against Dr. Parkman of being in a pro-slavery position I did make, though I certainly had no wish or intent to become, unnecessarily, his public accuser. But by that declaration I am willing to abide, and stand ready to produce the proof thereof. Dr. Parkman has signified himself here by a steady, unrelenting opposition to every kind and description of effort against slavery. I appeal to the whole community of Boston and American Unitarians generally, if this is not so. As to the assertion that it is on account of the intemperate language used by the Abolitionists, that Dr. Parkman is 'not an Abolitionist,' the Rev. gentleman who made it is mistaken; it is not true, though doubtless induced by him to be true. Dr. Parkman regarded the anti-slavery efforts of Dr. Channing and of Dr. Follen with no sympathy whatever, but the contrary. I have heard him speak disparagingly of the anti-slavery labors of Dr. Channing. He declared that Dr. Channing had much diminished his influence, and that of his other writings, thereby; and that his abolitionism was a weakness. Was it Dr. C.'s 'intemperate language' that repelled him? When, a year ago, an effort was made to induce the American Unitarian Association to reply to a letter from Ireland, addressed to American Unitarians generally, Dr. Parkman declared (without any concealment) that no letter on slavery should ever go forth from the American Unitarian Association. Was it the 'intemperate language' he feared? A few years ago, the captain of a New Bedford vessel, on a passage home from one of the ports of Virginia, discovered that he had a fugitive slave on board. The poor slave, yearning for that freedom which he felt God meant he should enjoy, took this method to escape from the iron boudoir which was alike cruel to body and to soul; he secreted himself in the hold of the ship. There he was found. The heartless, selfish captain put back his vessel, and, deaf to all the remonstrances and supplications of the slave, carried him again to chains and slavery, and to the 'tender mercies' of an exasperated master. And of this act Dr. Parkman distinctly, and without qualification, approved; had the captain not done so, said he, he would have disobeyed the express stipulations of the national compact! Thus a professed minister of the Gospel taught that the unrighteous laws of man are to be obeyed before the everlasting law of God. The 'intemperate language' of the Abolitionists, forsaken, is unpardonable in his eyes; but the inhuman, pitiless, heartless acts of a minion of slavery find no indignant rebuke from him! God judge between him and the Abolitionists! To my mind, no truth is

lost.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are, I admit, two ways of doing it—the right and the wrong. It is most likely, if such a case was reported to a special magistrate, who went to work in what he and others may call a manly and decisive way, why he would have had Mr. C. up, and inflicted upon him the severest penalty of the law, which, if I knew any thing of the circumstances of the party, he would have been unable to pay; and, above all, the poor apprentices would not have benefited any thing by such a proceeding—as the fine, if paid, would have gone into the treasury; therefore, I am satisfied I have done the needful in the right way.

A little circumspection, and condescension for the feelings of others, who are no parties to delinquencies, but unluckily linked or related to the delinquents, is both necessary and just, and never fails to insure you respect, which is your main support as a special magistrate.

In consenting to the foregoing arrangement, I trust I have done strict justice to the apprentices, and conferred a real advantage on the part of Mr. C. that he would give up the management of his estate, and appoint a very respectable man (whom I know) to take charge of it, if I would bring him to trial. This arrangement I at once agreed to, as I considered it much more advantageous to the apprentices to get rid of such a master, than fine him any sum whatever, which would have gone into the Island treasury, and it would have gone to the devil, and infected with its infamy, made him ten times worse than ever.

I took an early opportunity of visiting the estate in company with the new manager, and there explained to the negroes what I had done. They appeared greatly delighted, and seemed to be resolved to do their duty correctly.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are, I admit, two ways of doing it—the right and the wrong. It is most likely, if such a case was reported to a special magistrate, who went to work in what he and others may call a manly and decisive way, why he would have had Mr. C. up, and inflicted upon him the severest penalty of the law, which, if I knew any thing of the circumstances of the party, he would have been unable to pay; and, above all, the poor apprentices would not have benefited any thing by such a proceeding—as the fine, if paid, would have gone into the treasury; therefore, I am satisfied I have done the needful in the right way.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are, I admit, two ways of doing it—the right and the wrong. It is most likely, if such a case was reported to a special magistrate, who went to work in what he and others may call a manly and decisive way, why he would have had Mr. C. up, and inflicted upon him the severest penalty of the law, which, if I knew any thing of the circumstances of the party, he would have been unable to pay; and, above all, the poor apprentices would not have benefited any thing by such a proceeding—as the fine, if paid, would have gone into the treasury; therefore, I am satisfied I have done the needful in the right way.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are, I admit, two ways of doing it—the right and the wrong. It is most likely, if such a case was reported to a special magistrate, who went to work in what he and others may call a manly and decisive way, why he would have had Mr. C. up, and inflicted upon him the severest penalty of the law, which, if I knew any thing of the circumstances of the party, he would have been unable to pay; and, above all, the poor apprentices would not have benefited any thing by such a proceeding—as the fine, if paid, would have gone into the treasury; therefore, I am satisfied I have done the needful in the right way.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are, I admit, two ways of doing it—the right and the wrong. It is most likely, if such a case was reported to a special magistrate, who went to work in what he and others may call a manly and decisive way, why he would have had Mr. C. up, and inflicted upon him the severest penalty of the law, which, if I knew any thing of the circumstances of the party, he would have been unable to pay; and, above all, the poor apprentices would not have benefited any thing by such a proceeding—as the fine, if paid, would have gone into the treasury; therefore, I am satisfied I have done the needful in the right way.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are, I admit, two ways of doing it—the right and the wrong. It is most likely, if such a case was reported to a special magistrate, who went to work in what he and others may call a manly and decisive way, why he would have had Mr. C. up, and inflicted upon him the severest penalty of the law, which, if I knew any thing of the circumstances of the party, he would have been unable to pay; and, above all, the poor apprentices would not have benefited any thing by such a proceeding—as the fine, if paid, would have gone into the treasury; therefore, I am satisfied I have done the needful in the right way.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are, I admit, two ways of doing it—the right and the wrong. It is most likely, if such a case was reported to a special magistrate, who went to work in what he and others may call a manly and decisive way, why he would have had Mr. C. up, and inflicted upon him the severest penalty of the law, which, if I knew any thing of the circumstances of the party, he would have been unable to pay; and, above all, the poor apprentices would not have benefited any thing by such a proceeding—as the fine, if paid, would have gone into the treasury; therefore, I am satisfied I have done the needful in the right way.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are, I admit, two ways of doing it—the right and the wrong. It is most likely, if such a case was reported to a special magistrate, who went to work in what he and others may call a manly and decisive way, why he would have had Mr. C. up, and inflicted upon him the severest penalty of the law, which, if I knew any thing of the circumstances of the party, he would have been unable to pay; and, above all, the poor apprentices would not have benefited any thing by such a proceeding—as the fine, if paid, would have gone into the treasury; therefore, I am satisfied I have done the needful in the right way.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are, I admit, two ways of doing it—the right and the wrong. It is most likely, if such a case was reported to a special magistrate, who went to work in what he and others may call a manly and decisive way, why he would have had Mr. C. up, and inflicted upon him the severest penalty of the law, which, if I knew any thing of the circumstances of the party, he would have been unable to pay; and, above all, the poor apprentices would not have benefited any thing by such a proceeding—as the fine, if paid, would have gone into the treasury; therefore, I am satisfied I have done the needful in the right way.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are, I admit, two ways of doing it—the right and the wrong. It is most likely, if such a case was reported to a special magistrate, who went to work in what he and others may call a manly and decisive way, why he would have had Mr. C. up, and inflicted upon him the severest penalty of the law, which, if I knew any thing of the circumstances of the party, he would have been unable to pay; and, above all, the poor apprentices would not have benefited any thing by such a proceeding—as the fine, if paid, would have gone into the treasury; therefore, I am satisfied I have done the needful in the right way.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are, I admit, two ways of doing it—the right and the wrong. It is most likely, if such a case was reported to a special magistrate, who went to work in what he and others may call a manly and decisive way, why he would have had Mr. C. up, and inflicted upon him the severest penalty of the law, which, if I knew any thing of the circumstances of the party, he would have been unable to pay; and, above all, the poor apprentices would not have benefited any thing by such a proceeding—as the fine, if paid, would have gone into the treasury; therefore, I am satisfied I have done the needful in the right way.

Persons may cry out and say, the major in this case did not do his duty. There are,

clearer than this, that the professed minister of the Gospel, who fails to advocate a professedly moral and benevolent cause (in such a way as he may deem proper and right) does in effect oppose that cause. The community will, for a long time at least, reason thus about it; Christianity surely approves and befriends all that is good, and is opposed practically to all that is evil; now, if they, who are its teachers and exponents, do not defend and support a cause, it must be because it is intrinsically evil and unchristian. Especially will they do so, when they see these professed religious teachers in an attitude of constant hostility to such cause. This is one of those cases where he, who is not for us, is against us; actually, practically, intentionally, and before the whole community, against us, and against the cause, *however advocated*. Surely these fastidious gentlemen, if they chose, might at least attempt to "show us a more excellent way." They do nothing about it, save rail at those who, according to their light and skill, are striving to do something.

I make no apology for saying these things; for they are true. But I am sorry for the occasion. I certainly would have preferred to have the whole matter confined to this community. But my statement was so pointedly contradicted at the meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and declared himself to be "intimately acquainted with the whole fourteen or fifteen gentlemen who had signed the letter" of invitation. Perhaps he is; he is unknown to me. That may only give myself unknown. But I am sure he does not know some of our Boston men as well as he thinks he does. I allude to his remarks, only to notice one expression, viz., "He was not an advocate of slavery himself, for he was an Englishman." I am sorry to say that I cannot admit the soundness of his logic, though his heart may be true. We have sometimes found among Englishmen staunch supporters and cunning apologists for slavery, viewing the most noted, in this respect, in our own land. But see the following case, which I lately took from a public print:

BRANDING. Some time since, it was stated that a slave boy at Cape Girardeau, Missouri, had been branded on the face, with the words, "A slave for life." An editor at St. Louis having doubted the story, a correspondent of the *Recruit*, writing from Cape Girardeau, clinches it as follows: "If the editor wants proof of it, he comes down here, he can see the boy, the fiend who did the damnable deed, and the man that owns the boy; and if necessary, can have their names in full. They both live here. The man who did it is an *Englishman*! It would seem that, although they were willing the act should be done, still they do not like the public to know it, but dare not deny it; and if they do not look sharp, more will appear on the subject. The owner of the boy is a man of wealth, and all are surprised that he would have such an act done, as he has been looked upon, hitherto, as a man of good feelings, and a good master and good citizen."

I must bring my long letter to a conclusion. May you find strength and support, my dear Sir, in your efforts for truth, freedom, knowledge. They shall not tell less powerfully on the wrongs prevailing in your own land, because they include us of this distant land in their sympathy.

With sincere respect, believe me yours,

SAMUEL MAY, Jr.

To Rev. G. Armstrong.

From the London Patriot of August 2nd.

TOWER HAMLETS.

The nomination of the candidates, Sir W. Clay, Major-General Fox, and Mr. G. Thompson, for the representation of the Tower Hamlets, took place at Stepney-green on Thursday.

A vast assemblage was collected on the ground in front of the hustings at twelve o'clock, the hour appointed for the introductory proceedings, and the crowd, which betrayed the utmost excitement in the contest, carried on with a warmth and vigor somewhat exceptional at the present time, seemed throughout determined to compensate themselves in vociferation for the deficiency to which the major portion were evidently subjected in not being entitled to offer votes.

The appearance of Sir W. Clay and Major-General Fox, accompanied by a large body of their friends and supporters, was the signal for an outburst of hissing, groaning and shouting, so general, that such faint cheers as might have been tendered to these gentlemen in the tumult were overpowered and heard; but when the "favorite" and bird candidate showed himself, the sound, while fully sustained in intensity, changed its character, and the applause did not cease until a new object attracted and retained attention in the person of the high constable, attired in imposing official uniform, who advanced on horseback and proclaimed silence.

Mr. Child, the returning officer, having read the writ and complied with the customary election formalities.

Mr. Simpson proposed Sir W. Clay as a "fit and proper person to represent the constituency in Parliament."

Mr. Lawrence seconded the nomination.

Sir E. N. Buxton, seconded by Mr. Martineau, seconded Major-General Fox.

Mr. G. Thompson was nominated by Mr. Morley, who said, that in doing so he enunciated the principle that it was not the province of the civil power to interfere, directly or indirectly, with religious liberty of all. (Cheers.) Persons who were committed to the principle of endowment were at variance with this doctrine. They (the electors) would declare *any* endowment or devotion of public means to ecclesiastical purposes, and put a stop to it. (Cheers, and a cry, "They won't let you?")

Mr. G. Fox seconded the nomination.

Mr. W. Clay, the candidate, waited, and after a long interval succeeded, by exemplary patience in the endurance of the tumult, in obtaining a partial hearing; he had conscientiously endeavored to discharge his duty, and seeing nothing to be ashamed of in his past career, he毫不羞愧地 asked them once again to elect him as their representative. (Hisses, and a voice, "It's no g., my unblunt brith.") At many of these he had found opponents; but at none did he encounter any individual ready to accuse him of having swerved one hair's breadth from the practice of those principles he had originally promulgated. He had earnestly consulted as a Member of the House of Commons the best interests of the nation, and no one would pretend to say he had either forgotten or neglected the local welfare of his own constituents. (Cheers and counter-cheers.)

From this topic he would turn to questions more immediately interesting—the questions affecting civil and religious liberty. (Cheers.) It would be easy for him to declare in general terms that never did a man enter the House of Commons more devoted than he to that great principle. (Oh, oh!) He might point to every action of his life for confirmation of the boast; but if fraud did not, as the rhetoricians told them, lurk in generalities, misconception and doubt did; and he would, therefore, clearly, and distinctly, and categorically explain what he means in promising his advocacy of civil and religious liberty. He meant his inclination to take away every shadow of civil disability that remained on any man in consequence of his creed. (Loud cheers.) Protestants, Catholics, and Dissenters ought to be alike able to enjoy perfect equality and license in the practice of the several religions which they respectively venerated. (Cheers.) He was not in favor of taxing any man for the maintenance of a religion with which he had no sympathy, and at the same time he wished it to be understood that he was opposed to the indiscriminate imposition of Church rates. He could not see the justice of raising funds by taxing all the people for the support of the opinions of only a portion of the people, and for this reason he would not be a slave to the will of the wickedness, and then, with faithful pleading and Christian rebuke, strive to bring them to hear and answer the call of humanity. There is no Abolitionist in the land that would not joyfully render every aid in his power to the slaveholder, trying to escape from his unbalanced position, as to the poor, trembling slave, hunted by the enemies of his soul from slavery, and begging for shelter and concealment. Judge, all honest and candid men, whether we are not right in endeavoring to clear ourselves from all participation in slavery, and to lead others to do the same. We are convinced that it is our duty not to go with

It has been communicated to Dr. G., that Mr. Armstrong, though so situated, did not come to convey that meaning. In the after-proceedings of the day on the occasion of the meeting at Hackney, Mr. Armstrong was more correctly understood, where he is rightly represented to have merely stated, that Dr. Gannett had lately said in a sermon, that hitherto he had been accustomed to think that it was the policy of the Unitarian Church to maintain silence on the question of slavery. He was now of a different opinion; he had publicly acknowledged himself to be wrong; and that now the time was come for all holy and good men to speak out boldly on this question. This was an encouraging circumstance, and ought to animate us to go on.—G. A.

If I rightly understand Dr. Beard, in his remarks at Hackney, and elsewhere since, he meant to confine himself to the relative position of abolitionists and themselves. Dr. B. would fracture his slaveholder, as if he were a Christian brother, on the plea of Christian charity. I cannot imagine that Christian grace to have been designed to impose any such duty. If the slaveholder be guilty of one of the greatest wrongs upon earth—the robbing a man from himself, and the treating of an immortal creature as a thing—Christian charity, which rejoices in the truth, not in iniquity, may—nay, does—require us to fraternize with him, but only as the philanthropist does with the criminal—as a Howard or a Fry would with the unfortunate victims of the law, and the hardened enemies of society.—G. A.

Others, though a multitude, though mighty and wealthy to do evil. We know we cannot serve God and Mammon; and we know equally well whom we ought to serve. Trusting, then, in God, and the might of his truth, we hope to be faithful to that cause. The community will, for a long time at least, reason thus about it; Christianity surely approves and befriends all that is good, and is opposed practically to all that is evil; now, if they, who are its teachers and exponents, do not defend and support a cause, it must be because it is intrinsically evil and unchristian. Especially will they do so, when they see these professed religious teachers in an attitude of constant hostility to such cause.

This is one of those cases where he, who is not for us, is against us; actually, practically, intentionally, and before the whole community, against us, and against the cause, *however advocated*.

Surely these fastidious gentlemen, if they chose, might at least attempt to "show us a more excellent way." They do nothing about it, save rail at those who, according to their light and skill, are striving to do something.

I make no apology for saying these things; for they are true. But I am sorry for the occasion. I certainly would have preferred to have the whole matter confined to this community. But my statement was so pointedly contradicted at the meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and declared himself to be "intimately acquainted with the whole fourteen or fifteen gentlemen who had signed the letter" of invitation. Perhaps he is; he is unknown to me. That may only give myself unknown. But I am sure he does not know some of our Boston men as well as he thinks he does. I allude to his remarks, only to notice one expression, viz., "He was not an advocate of slavery himself, for he was an Englishman." I am sorry to say that I cannot admit the soundness of his logic, though his heart may be true. We have sometimes found among Englishmen staunch supporters and cunning apologists for slavery, viewing the most noted, in this respect, in our own land. But see the following case, which I lately took from a public print:

BRANDING. Some time since, it was stated that a slave boy at Cape Girardeau, Missouri, had been branded on the face, with the words, "A slave for life." An editor at St. Louis having doubted the story, a correspondent of the *Recruit*, writing from Cape Girardeau, clinches it as follows: "If the editor wants proof of it, he comes down here, he can see the boy, the fiend who did the damnable deed, and the man that owns the boy; and if necessary, can have their names in full. They both live here. The man who did it is an *Englishman*! It would seem that, although they were willing the act should be done, still they do not like the public to know it, but dare not deny it; and if they do not look sharp, more will appear on the subject. The owner of the boy is a man of wealth, and all are surprised that he would have such an act done, as he has been looked upon, hitherto, as a man of good feelings, and a good master and good citizen."

I must bring my long letter to a conclusion. May you find strength and support, my dear Sir, in your efforts for truth, freedom, knowledge. They shall not tell less powerfully on the wrongs prevailing in your own land, because they include us of this distant land in their sympathy.

With sincere respect, believe me yours,

SAMUEL MAY, Jr.

To Rev. G. Armstrong.

From the London Patriot of August 2nd.

TOWER HAMLETS.

The nomination of the candidates, Sir W. Clay, Major-General Fox, and Mr. G. Thompson, for the representation of the Tower Hamlets, took place at Stepney-green on Thursday.

A vast assemblage was collected on the ground in front of the hustings at twelve o'clock, the hour appointed for the introductory proceedings, and the crowd, which betrayed the utmost excitement in the contest, carried on with a warmth and vigor somewhat exceptional at the present time, seemed throughout determined to compensate themselves in vociferation for the deficiency to which the major portion were evidently subjected in not being entitled to offer votes.

The appearance of Sir W. Clay and Major-General Fox, accompanied by a large body of their friends and supporters, was the signal for an outburst of hissing, groaning and shouting, so general, that such faint cheers as might have been tendered to these gentlemen in the tumult were overpowered and heard; but when the "favorite" and bird candidate showed himself, the sound, while fully sustained in intensity, changed its character, and the applause did not cease until a new object attracted and retained attention in the person of the high constable, attired in imposing official uniform, who advanced on horseback and proclaimed silence.

Mr. Child, the returning officer, having read the writ and complied with the customary election formalities.

Mr. Simpson proposed Sir W. Clay as a "fit and proper person to represent the constituency in Parliament."

Mr. Lawrence seconded the nomination.

Sir E. N. Buxton, seconded by Mr. Martineau, seconded Major-General Fox.

Mr. G. Thompson was nominated by Mr. Morley, who said, that in doing so he enunciated the principle that it was not the province of the civil power to interfere, directly or indirectly, with religious liberty of all. (Cheers.) Persons who were committed to the principle of endowment were at variance with this doctrine. They (the electors) would declare *any* endowment or devotion of public means to ecclesiastical purposes, and put a stop to it. (Cheers, and a cry, "They won't let you?")

Mr. G. Fox seconded the nomination.

Mr. W. Clay, the candidate, waited, and after a long interval succeeded, by exemplary patience in the endurance of the tumult, in obtaining a partial hearing; he had conscientiously endeavored to discharge his duty, and seeing nothing to be ashamed of in his past career, he毫不羞愧地 asked them once again to elect him as their representative. (Hisses, and a voice, "It's no g., my unblunt brith.") At many of these he had found opponents; but at none did he encounter any individual ready to accuse him of having swerved one hair's breadth from the practice of those principles he had originally promulgated. He had earnestly consulted as a Member of the House of Commons the best interests of the nation, and no one would pretend to say he had either forgotten or neglected the local welfare of his own constituents. (Cheers and counter-cheers.)

From this topic he would turn to questions more immediately interesting—the questions affecting civil and religious liberty. (Cheers.) It would be easy for him to declare in general terms that never did a man enter the House of Commons more devoted than he to that great principle. (Oh, oh!) He might point to every action of his life for confirmation of the boast; but if fraud did not, as the rhetoricians told them, lurk in generalities, misconception and doubt did; and he would, therefore, clearly, and distinctly, and categorically explain what he means in promising his advocacy of civil and religious liberty. He meant his inclination to take away every shadow of civil disability that remained on any man in consequence of his creed. (Loud cheers.) Protestants, Catholics, and Dissenters ought to be alike able to enjoy perfect equality and license in the practice of the several religions which they respectively venerated. (Cheers.) He was not in favor of taxing any man for the maintenance of a religion with which he had no sympathy, and at the same time he wished it to be understood that he was opposed to the indiscriminate imposition of Church rates. He could not see the justice of raising funds by taxing all the people for the support of the opinions of only a portion of the people, and for this reason he would not be a slave to the will of the wickedness, and then, with faithful pleading and Christian rebuke, strive to bring them to hear and answer the call of humanity. There is no Abolitionist in the land that would not joyfully render every aid in his power to the slaveholder, trying to escape from his unbalanced position, as to the poor, trembling slave, hunted by the enemies of his soul from slavery, and begging for shelter and concealment. Judge, all honest and candid men, whether we are not right in endeavoring to clear ourselves from all participation in slavery, and to lead others to do the same. We are convinced that it is our duty not to go with

It has been communicated to Dr. G., that Mr. Armstrong, though so situated, did not come to convey that meaning. In the after-proceedings of the day on the occasion of the meeting at Hackney, Mr. Armstrong was more correctly understood, where he is rightly represented to have merely stated, that Dr. Gannett had lately said in a sermon, that hitherto he had been accustomed to think that it was the policy of the Unitarian Church to maintain silence on the question of slavery. He was now of a different opinion; he had publicly acknowledged himself to be wrong; and that now the time was come for all holy and good men to speak out boldly on this question. This was an encouraging circumstance, and ought to animate us to go on.—G. A.

If I rightly understand Dr. Beard, in his remarks at Hackney, and elsewhere since, he meant to confine himself to the relative position of abolitionists and themselves. Dr. B. would fracture his slaveholder, as if he were a Christian brother, on the plea of Christian charity. I cannot imagine that Christian grace to have been designed to impose any such duty. If the slaveholder be guilty of one of the greatest wrongs upon earth—the robbing a man from himself, and the treating of an immortal creature as a thing—Christian charity, which rejoices in the truth, not in iniquity, may—nay, does—require us to fraternize with him, but only as the philanthropist does with the criminal—as a Howard or a Fry would with the unfortunate victims of the law, and the hardened enemies of society.—G. A.

Others, though a multitude, though mighty and wealthy to do evil. We know we cannot serve God and Mammon; and we know equally well whom we ought to serve. Trusting, then, in God, and the might of his truth, we hope to be faithful to that cause. The community will, for a long time at least, reason thus about it; Christianity surely approves and befriends all that is good, and is opposed practically to all that is evil; now, if they, who are its teachers and exponents, do not defend and support a cause, it must be because it is intrinsically evil and unchristian. Especially will they do so, when they see these professed religious teachers in an attitude of constant hostility to such cause.

This is one of those cases where he, who is not for us, is against us; actually, practically, intentionally, and before the whole community, against us, and against the cause, *however advocated*.

Surely these fastidious gentlemen, if they chose, might at least attempt to "show us a more excellent way." They do nothing about it, save rail at those who, according to their light and skill, are striving to do something.

Major-General Fox next advanced, but the reception which he met prevented a word he said being heard beyond those immediately around him. The noise can only be described as "hooting." Innumerable questions, couched in puzzling phraseology, were put to the candidate, but the gallant officer was not sooner turned to the right or to the left side, as if to give a reply, than he was assailed by a volley of hisses. In a portion of his address, which may almost be said to have been dumb-show, the word "bishop" was frequently pronounced, and that day's Number of *Punch*, with the principal woodcut prominent, was immediately waved in the sight of the crowd by a man who had been elevated for the purpose on the shoulders of those in his neighborhood. This incident occasioned great laughter; "cheers for *Punch*" were suggested; and in the increased confusion thus incurred, it is not surprising that the views of the gallant General with respect to the religious topics touched on by the preceding speaker were not distinctly comprehended. Generally, so far as we were enabled to learn, he coincided in all the opinions of Sir W. Clay. He refused to pledge himself on some points, on the ground that he was not a member of the Unitarian Church, and that he was not favorable to the same. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:

Majority for Thompson, 3,925. The gross poll up to four o'clock has been definitely given by the contending parties. The Central Committee of Sir W. Clay, with whom that of General Fox is supposed in this respect to agree, give this account:</p

SETH SPRAGUE.

One of the last injunctions which Mr. Garrison gave us, previous to his departure, was, to perform the duty to the venerable memory of this Father of the American Anti-Slavery Cause, which was a pressing engagement prevented him from undertaking himself. He could not have assigned us a more grateful task. We loved and revered the much the person and character of this admirable man, and to be most ready to do what feeble justice we could to his services and his virtues. We only regret that their eulogy was not reserved for those better able to perform it justice, than ours.

There are few objects more beautiful than a cheerful, happy, virtuous old age. An old age which the entire of a temperate prime has blessed with all that should accompany it, as

Honor, love, obedience, troops of friends,

the remembrance of a life well-spent and the calm expectation of future good. To honor the hoary head, when the years, which have shed their snows, have been years of activity and beneficence, a natural impulse of a good heart and a well-nurtured mind. But, especially, when an Old Age is given with living labors in the great struggle for Human Freedom, to which the Spring-tide and the Summer-Prime of life had been devoted, is its beauty the most reverend and its crown of gray hairs the most glorious to behold.

Such was the old age of the venerable man who was recently passed away from among us, and gone from his labors to his rest. He had lived far beyond the appointed age of man, and stood upon the threshold of his nineteenth year. His eye was dimmed, and his natural strength abated, the lapse of his years, but his heart remained fresh and young to the last. He had discovered the true fountain of youth, he had laid hold of the genuine Elixir of life, and he defied the worst ravages of Time. A strong and abiding interest, imbued in boyhood, and continuing to the last, in the promotion and security of the liberties of mankind, an interest unequalled, saved him from the listless vacuity when often makes the close of a life devoted to great and personal objects its own appropriate punishment. He was taken from the round of selfish pleasure by the might of a great Principle, and as he believed it in faith and with active zeal, it blessed him with exemption from the worst infirmities of a protracted existence.

Mr. Sprague was born on the 4th of July, 1769, sixteen years before the Declaration of Independence; and, having died on the 8th of July, 1847, he was just entering upon his EIGHTY EIGHTH year, at the time of his decease. His earliest act was to wish, considering the peculiar complexion of the times in which his youth was passed, was the most natural manifestation of the ruling principle of life. In 1776, at the age of sixteen, he enlisted as a continental army, and served in its ranks for some time in the struggle then in progress with the mother country. Of the particulars of his service, as of the time of his discharge, we are not informed. But, at an early period of life, he was married to Deborah Sampson, a woman, like himself, of the stock of the Puritans, and, like himself, too, a worthy her of that best of blood.

He lived in her companionship for more than sixty years, and saw sixteen sons and daughters grow to maturity around him. All of them, we believe, were married, and the number of his descendants has passed beyond his own knowledge, long before his death. They could not have amounted to much less than two hundred. He saw them all progress, and some of them eminent for success in business and in life. Mrs. Sprague died only two or three years before her husband.

Mr. Sprague's first pursuit was Agriculture, which he subsequently exchanged for Trade, in which he became extensively engaged. He was not one of those who define 'enough' to be 'a little more than they have'; and so he retired from business some twenty years before his death, after he had accumulated what, to his simple tastes and habits, was a moderate competency. He was for many years in public life, having represented his Town and County in the House, or in the Senate of Massachusetts for thirty successive years. He served twice as Elector for President and Vice President of the United States, and was more than once elected Executive Counsellor, which office he never accepted.

He was about thirty years of age at the time the Federal Constitution went into operation, and he was among those who voted for its adoption with a strong faith in its efficacy as the Palladium of Freedom.

When the Great Parties, for so many years agitated the country, sprung into existence in the fading presence of the French Revolution, he took a side decidedly, warmly and consistently with the Democratic, Republican, or Jeffersonian Division.

Whatever opinions may prevail as to the relative merits of those parties, no one, who knew Mr. Sprague, can doubt that he made his election deliberately and with the firm conviction that he was best serving the cause of Liberty and his Country.

His zeal, industry and tact as a politician were unsurpassed in his region.

He gave himself to this work with the same enthusiasm and sim-

pleness of mind which he afterwards brought to the Anti-Slavery warfare.

But he never sought, nor accepted, any office of profit, usually the object and reward of partisan activity.

Mr. Sprague was already an old man, past the appointed three-score years and ten, when the modern Anti-Slavery Movement began in this Country, —a movement which is distinguished from all previous efforts for Abolition, by the adoption of the cardinal principle, that IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION IS THE DUTY OF THE MASTER AND RIGHT OF THE SLAVE.

Old as he was, however, he enlisted

in this new warfare, and served conspicuously in all its campaigns, up to the time of his death.

The Standard states that a writer in a Plymouth paper, in an obituary notice of Mr. Sprague, affirms that 'he was not what is called at the present time an abolitionist.'

This writer, whatever he may be, must have been singularly ignorant of the history of the Anti-Slavery cause, as a sermon-writer.

Such witness, under his own hand, as this letter contains, to the might of Abolitionism, is, therefore, worth a passing word.

We have also inserted a communication, called forth by this letter, which appeared originally in the Boston Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of the Courier, and which we believe to be the original of the article in this particular.

It is to the editor of

POETRY.

From the Christian.

MAN.

BY J. E. FRESE.

Man is not always man, nor woman always woman;
For some there are, who, though in stature look like
them,

And bear, thus far, the impress of their God,
Yet still they lack the principle within,
Which makes them great above their fellow worms;
The worm that crawls—the insect buzzing round,
In structure are as great as man can boast,

And, hence, the difference must lay in the mind,

Which, if once lacking, makes them equal all!

Some men are like a fair and precious nut,
Whose outward look beeps a good within;

But when 'tis cracked, behold, the kernel's gone,

And nought remains but empty, tasteless shell!

Some women, too, like fruits of fairest look,

Both to the eye angelic forms appear;

But, when the paring has been taken off,

And thus prepared, we taste what heavenly seemed,

We find a poison lurking deep within,

At a moment of good, save what the eye had seen!

Another class had souls of goodly size,

But from the crushing of a pride without,

And passions strong contending fierce within—

They live inactive—die with none to bless!

And, yet another hath still larger souls,

Longing to do whatever good they can;

But for a want of channels to flow out,

Or means, by which those channels to extend,

They live unnoticed—die unbless'd by man!

And, yet still, others claim our notice here—

"Tis they who, though in forms, perhaps, less fair,

Yet, with God's impress stamped upon their heart,

Which makes them noble, gen'rous, good and kind,

They, who, in love, oft seek the widow's cot,

And pour the balm of Friendship in her heart—

They, who are honest, noblest work of God,

In body massive—semi-god in mind!

Thus mortals differ in their souls and means;

Some none, some little, medium, large and great,

And as this difference so man truly is

No man, a man, great man, greater still!

WORK IS PRAYER.

BY DUGAN.

Brothers! be ye who ye may—

Sons of men! I bid ye pray!

Pray unceas'ning! pray with might!

Pray in darkness! pray in light!

Life hath yet no hours to spare;

Life is toil—and toil is prayer.

Life is toil, and all that lives

Sacrifice of labor gives!

Water, fire, and air, and earth,

Rest not, pause not, from their birth;

Sacred toil doth nature share—

Labor! labor!—work is prayer.

<div data-bbox="60 1507 166 1516" data-label